



PTO/SB/21 (08-03)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)		Application Number	09/785,423
		Filing Date	February 20, 2001
		First Named Inventor	Hong-Sung Song
		Art Unit	3728
		Examiner Name	J. M. Mohandesi
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	1	Attorney Docket Number	8733.400.00-US

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): Reply Brief (in triplicate; 3 pages)		
<table border="1"><tr><td>Remarks</td><td></td></tr></table>			Remarks	
Remarks				

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual name	MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP Rebecca Goldman Rudich
Signature	
Date	October 18, 2004



AF
Zm

PATENT
8733.400.00-US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Hong-Sung Song

Customer No.: 30827

Application No.: 09/785,423

Confirmation No.: 1942

Filed: February 20, 2001

Art Unit: 3728

For: TAPE CARRIER PACKAGE FILM

Examiner: J. M. Mohandesi

REPLY BRIEF

Attention: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
Honorable Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answer mailed August 19, 2004, Appellant submits the following Reply Brief in the above-identified application (transmitted in triplicate):

ARGUMENTS

Further to the arguments made in the Appeal Brief filed on July 29, 2004 and in reply to the Examiner's Answer dated August 19, 2004, Appellant asserts a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established as discussed below.

In response to Appellant's argument that the combination of Honda and Hashimoto fails to disclose or suggest a tape carrier package film that comprises a tape carrier part defined by depressions and having a mounting portion for mounting an integrated circuit; and a plurality of punching holes, the Examiner asserts that Honda discloses all of the claimed elements except that the package carrier is a package film carrier. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that the recess (34') of Honda equates to the claimed tape carrier part, the

feeding holes (36') of Honda equate to the claimed sprocket holes, and the lead storing parts (34b') of Honda equate to the claimed punching holes. These assertions are unfounded for the following reasons.

First, independent claims 1 and 5 both recite that the tape carrier part is defined by *depressions* and includes a mounting portion for a driving integrated circuit. In contrast, the portion of Honda which the Examiner asserts is equivalent to the claimed tape carrier part is defined by a single recess. Furthermore, the recess fails to include a portion for *mounting* an integrated circuit. To the contrary, electronic components are only stored in the recess of Honda until they are mounted on circuit boards. (See column 1, lines 35-45 of Honda) Therefore, even if, *arguendo*, one skilled in the art were to interpret the phrase "depression" as being equivalent to a recess, as suggested by the Examiner, the combination of Honda and Hashimoto would still fail to render claims 1 and 5 unpatentable because the combination discloses a *single* recess/depression for *storing* electronic components and not *depressions* and a mounting portion as claimed.

Second, independent claims 1 and 5 both recite that the tape carrier package film includes a plurality of punching holes formed by cutting a part of the tape carrier package part and a part of the peripheral part. The punching holes assist in separating the tape carrier package part from the peripheral part. In contrast, Honda discloses a tape carrier comprising a recess for storing electronic components that are later removed and mounted on circuit boards. (See column 1, lines 35-45 of Honda). To prevent damage to the components, specifically bending the leads, the recess according to Honda is formed in the shape of the electronic component to be stored. For example, in Fig. 4 each recess 34' comprises a main body storing part 34a and two lead storing parts 34b' in order to store a ceramic capacitor.

(See also, column 4, lines 40-53 of Honda) Nowhere in Honda is there any disclosure or suggestion of separating the recess from the carrier tape, much less a plurality of punching holes that assist in the separation. Accordingly, the Examiner's assertion that the lead storing recesses 34b' of Honda are equivalent to the claimed plurality of punching holes is unfounded.

For any one of the reasons presented above, claims 1 and 5 are patentably distinguishable over the combination of Honda and Hashimoto. Furthermore, claims 2-4 and 6-17 variously depend from independent claims 1 and 5. Therefore, claims 2-4 and 6-17 are patentably distinguishable over the combination of Honda and Hashimoto for at least those reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 5. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be reversed.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: October 18, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Rebecca G. Rudich
Registration No.: 41,786
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
Attorney for Appellants